

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 23, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1-16 were pending, and rejected claims 1-16. Claims 1, 10, 11 and 13-16 have been amended, claim 17 is new, claim 9 has been cancelled, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-8 and 10-17 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Borgida, U.S. Patent 5,418,943, in view of Corey, U.S. Patent No. 5,987,446, in further view of Schmidt, EP000770967A2.

Borgida discusses a knowledge base that queries a database through a translation system. Borgida integrates the knowledge bases management system with a database. The translation system translates a compositional type query into a database query.

Corey is directed to a system in which a user query is used to access several different search engines and the single result from the multiple engines with the highest correlation to the query is used as the response.

In contrast, the present claims are directed to a system that makes it possible to reduce the period to provide services. When there exists conditions in the read-out mediating condition list data, the mediating service processing unit of the present invention, fixes the unfixed conditions by obtaining information from another unit in accordance with a described instruction and by merging it with unfixed conditions. Achievement of matching at a high accuracy is thus made possible by reducing a user's input to the minimum necessary through the acquisition of dynamic conditions, shortage conditions, unmatched conditions and the like that are difficult to express in mediating conditions of other units.

In a case where calculating conditions exist in the read-out mediating condition list data, the mediating service processing unit of the present invention executes a prescribed calculating expression on the basis of other mediating conditions and merges the result of the calculation with the calculating conditions. This is particular this is performed by the mediating service processing unit executing a predetermined calculation on the basis of conditions derived from merging through referring to the personal information storing unit or inquiring to the user and merging the result of the calculation with the calculating conditions.

In accordance with this understanding, claim 1 has been amended to recite:

a mediation service processing unit which reads out the mediating condition list data designated in correspondence to a user request from said mediating condition storing unit, obtains information selected from another information storing unit on the basis of one item selected from a plurality of items described in specific conditions for the specific conditions having unfixed contents in the read-out mediating condition list data by merging the specific conditions, with said mediating conditions, generates mediation result information which satisfies said mediating condition list data including the specific conditions having the thus fixed contents, and presents said information to the user,
wherein, in the case where a calculating instruction exists in the read-out mediating condition list data, said mediation service processing unit executes a predetermined calculating expression of the basis of other mediating conditions and merges a result of said calculation

Claims 13-16 have been amended in a manner similar to the amendment to claim 1.

Further, Borgida, Corey, and Schmidt fail to teach the use of unfixed or variable information is produced by the search engines in claims 1 and 13-16. Nor do the references teach or suggest discussion of obtaining unfixed information based on specific condition of a mediating condition list. There is also no teaching of merging information much less fixed and unfixed information. Therefore, Borgida, Corey, and Schmidt taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest the elements of claims 1 and 13-16 or the claims dependent therefrom.

Further, Borgida, Corey, and Schmidt fail to teach or suggest “wherein said mediation service processing unit designates and reads out specific mediating condition list data by analyzing an uncertain, rough, and abstract request from the user,” as in dependent claim 3.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM

Claim 17 is new. The prior art fails to teach or suggest the results of a mediation are further altered by the execution of a predetermined calculating expression when the mediation condition list so instructs.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 1-8 and 10-17 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

Serial No. 09/738,285

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: /March 23, 2007/

By: /James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501